

REMARKS

In the Official Action of October 19, 2009 the Examiner maintained the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Furusawa and included a sketch of Fig. 19c of that reference to support the Examiner's position. Applicant still feels that this "reading" of claim 1 on Fig. 19c was an unreasonable and strained reading which would not be so understood by one skilled in the art, nevertheless applicant has amended claim 1 in a manner to even more sharply distinguish over this reference.

Thus, claim 1 has been amended to now clearly recite that the second section of the open slot not only leads from the juncture with the first section back toward the distal end of the elongated slot, but that it is also of a width decreasing from the first second to its end terminating short of the end face. Fig. 19c of the primary reference could not be considered as including this feature under any reasonable interpretation of Fig. 19c by one skilled in the art. It is submitted, therefore, that claim 1 now clearly distinguishes over this primary reference.

Independent claim 13 has been similarly amended, and is therefore clearly distinguished over this reference for the same reasons.

The remaining claims all depend from either independent claim 1 or independent claim 13, and are therefore submitted to be allowable with those claims for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13, apart from the additional features added in the respective dependent claims.

It is to be noted, however, that claim 5 adds the additional feature that the second slot section is formed in a plane parallel to the longitudinal axis of the elongated shaft. In Fig. 19c of the primary reference, this second section is clearly perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the elongated shaft.

A similar feature as claim 5 is brought out in claim 6, and is therefore submitted to be allowable with that claim for the same reasons.

Dependent claim 9 adds the additional feature that the distal end of the elongated shaft formed with the recess is of increase diameter, etc., as clearly shown, for example, in Fig. 7 of the drawings in the present application. Such a construction is also clearly not present in the primary reference.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the claims, as now amended, are clearly allowable over the cited references.

The specification has been amended on Page 9 merely to provide clear antecedent terminology for the language used in the claims. Clearly, this language is obviously and non-ambiguously apparent from the description, particularly the drawings, and therefore does not involve the introduction of any new matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56,437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: January 19, 2010